

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TERION COLLINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

HEATHER SHIRLEY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:23-cv-00483 CDB (PC)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR
FAILURE TO OBEY LOCAL RULES**

14-DAY DEADLINE TO RESPOND

Plaintiff Terion Collins is proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

I. RELEVANT BACKGROUND

The Court issued its Discovery and Scheduling Order on January 11, 2024. (Doc. 35.)

On June 5, 2024, Defendants filed their Motion to Compel, concerning Plaintiff's failure to respond to Defendants' interrogatories, set one. (Doc. 36.)

Although more than 21 days have elapsed since Defendants filed their motion, Plaintiff has failed respond in any way.

II. DISCUSSION

The Local Rules, corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide, "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule

or within the inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110. “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets” and, in exercising that power, may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Auth., City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, obey a court order, or comply with local rules. *See, e.g., Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order to amend a complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).

Local Rule 230(l) concerns motions in prisoner actions. It provides that an “[o]pposition, if any, to the granting of [a] motion shall be served and filed by the responding party not more than twenty-one (21) days after the date of service of the motion. A responding party who has no opposition to the granting of the motion shall serve and file a statement to that effect” Local Rule 230(l).

Here, Defendants filed and served their motion to compel on June 5, 2024. (Doc. 36.) The motion argues Plaintiff has failed to respond to Defendants’ interrogatories and seeks an order compelling Plaintiff to provide responses. (*Id.*) Pursuant to Local Rule 230(l), Plaintiff is required to file either an opposition or statement of non-opposition to Defendants’ motion within 21 days of the date of service of the motion. More than 21 days have now passed, yet Plaintiff has failed to file either an opposition to Defendants’ motion to compel, or a statement of non-opposition to that motion. Therefore, Plaintiff has failed to comply with this Court’s Local Rules. *See Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to show cause in writing, **within 14 days** of the date of service of this order, why this action should not be dismissed for his failure to comply with the Court’s Local Rules. Alternatively, within that same time, Plaintiff may file an opposition, or statement of non-opposition, to Defendants’ pending motion to compel.

//

IT IS SO ORDERED.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE